Commission." As explained above, however, because the NEPOOL tariffs did not govern WMECO's arrangements with petitioner, WMECO's pass-through of costs did not violate the NEPOOL tariff. Furthermore, information about a wholesale contract such as that between petitioner and WMECO, including its key terms, must be filed with the Commission. See 16 U.S.C. 824d(c). Thus, FERC's decision in this case, and the D.C. Circuit's affirmance, were entirely consistent with the longstanding requirements of the final rate doctrine.

CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be denied.

Respectfully submitted.

PAUL D. CLEMENT
Solicitor General

CYNTHIA A. MARLETTE
General Counsel
DENNIS LANE
Solicitor
CAROL J. BANTA
Attorney
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

JUNE 2005